

Reply to Office Action dated April 23, 2008

**Amendment to the Drawing**

A replacement sheet of drawings is being submitted, with numerals 15 and 16 being added to the front and rear frame of Figure 1.

### **REMARKS**

.Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present patent application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 2, and 4-6 are pending in the application.

#### **Telephone Interview**

Applicant notes with appreciation the telephone interview conducted with Examiner Hansen on August 8, 2008. During that interview, the limitations of the present invention were discussed, especially the interaction of the dome-shaped projections on the rails and drive frame. No agreement was reached as to the allowability of the claims over the prior art. However, it was agreed that the specification and drawings will be amended to provide reference numerals for the front and rear frame. The present amendment is being presented for full consideration.

#### **Drawings**

The Examiner rejected the drawings as not showing the front frame and rear frame. By way of the present amendment, applicant has amended Figure 1 to add reference numerals 15 and 16 to the front frame and rear frame. The description of these two reference numerals is now included in paragraph [0011]. Applicant submits that this does not include any new matter since the frames are clearly shown in the drawings and were previously described in the claims. Merely adding reference numerals to these frames is not considered to be new matter.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner objected to the phrase "into a load-bearing rail". By way of the present amendment, applicant has amended this phrase in both claims 5 and 6 so as to relate these rails to the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, this rejection is overcome.

Reply to Office Action dated April 23, 2008

The Examiner also rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 112. However, this claim has now been canceled, rendering this part of the rejection moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Chang (U.S. Pat. 5,164,886). Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 9, 10 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over Chang in view of Hsu (U.S. Pat. 5,031,070) and Jeong (U.S. Pat. 6,404,624). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, it is noted that applicant cancelled claims 9, 10, 13 and 14 so that the first rejection is rendered moot.

In regard to claim 1, the Examiner states that Chang teaches a computer chassis having a frame with one load-bearing rail 5 extending to the rear frame. A plurality of protrusions 51 are formed on top of the rail and support a chassis cover. The protrusions secure a movable structure 6. The Examiner admits that Chang does not show the rail being in support and contact with the cover or show a plurality of rails or show portions of the structure having the same shape as the protrusions.

The Examiner relies on Hsu to show a computer chassis with a plurality of rails. The Examiner relies on Jeong to show the rails supporting the cover and to provide protrusions.

Applicant admits that claim 1 as presently amended defines over this combination of references. Applicant has now made it clear that the rails have a plurality of dome-shaped protrusions formed on the rails and that the drive frame has interface structures having a similar size and shape which are secured over the protrusions to secure the drive frame in two directions. Applicant submits that these features are now shown in any of the three references. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1 and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, each of these claims recite additional features that make them additionally allowable.

Reply to Office Action dated April 23, 2008


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, at the telephone number listed below.

A petition for a one month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made and the appropriate fee of \$60.00 is being charged per the attached Credit Card authorization.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-3828 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Joe McKinney Muncy  
Registration No. 32334  
PO Box 1364  
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364  
703.621.7140

Date: August 21, 2008

**ROBERT F. GNUSE**  
Registration # 27295